
Vol. XVI No. 2

Winter 1993

Creation

Social Science

and Humanities

QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

ISSN 0740-3399

ANNOUNCEMENT

CSSHQ TO END PUBLICATION

After prayerful deliberation and consultation with the voting members of the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society, the Board of Directors of the CSSHS voted at the annual meeting on September 30, 1993 to bring the society to a close as of September, 1994. The Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly will cease publication after the Summer, 1994 issue. Members and subscribers who have paid in advance beyond the current publication year (Vol. 16) will receive refunds. Mrs. Myers, Mrs. Powell, and I are deeply appreciative of the prayers, support, fellowship, and encouragement that the quarterly's readers have provided over the 16 years of publication.

Thank you and may God's richest blessings be with you all.

Paul Ackerman, editor

EDITORIALS

OUT WITH THE NEW AND IN WITH THE OLD

Such an idea is almost heretical in our culture, but I believe that the world around us testifies that all the "new" things have proven to be evil—sex education, value-free teaching, humanism, self-esteem, and situation ethics.

We all know, however, that there is nothing new under the sun and that these "new" things are as old as the Garden of Eden. But there are things older than that—the character of God, for instance. Love, truth, joy, responsibility, integrity, and many others are the truly old things—having existed in God from eternity.

So, out with the new and in with the old for the coming year. Grab your Bibles and read those difficult parts that challenge your modernistic ideas—then submit to God.

— Paul deParrie

HUMAN LIFE IS INFINITELY VALUABLE

If one believes that mankind is created by a purposeless and accidental arrangement of atoms and molecules which has resulted from evolution during billions of years, why should it be such a tragedy if that particular molecular arrangement ceases to exist? Maybe in billions of years another accidental arrangement will produce a similar or even an improved brand of consciousness.

Life is infinitely valuable because it is an expression of the being of God the Creator. "God made man in His own image." The divine essence elevates human life to a higher plane than the life of other animal species or any other feature of the material creation. It is this divine image that validates the Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill," and which guarantees the assurance of eternal life.

— Dr. Fred Schwarz

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

The article on Galileo by Edward Coleson in the Summer 1993 issue of *CSSH Quarterly* reveals that Mr. Coleson is rather ill-informed about the geocentric/heliocentric controversy. I will mention a few things that give me this impression.

(1) I don't think the lack of parallax observations was the only reason the Greeks rejected heliocentricity. I don't think the heliocentric theory was "promising" to them, and I don't think the geocentric system gave them "nothing but trouble." It is still used today for observational astronomy and for navigation, both space and terrestrial, and serves quite well, in spite of the fact that "everybody knows" the earth "actually" moves. Furthermore, the later discovery of parallax is no proof whatsoever of heliocentricity.

(2) The planets never "back up" when the geocentric system is used. The so-called "retrograde" motion referred to by Mr. Coleson is a moving backward *against the background of the stars*, which are arbitrarily assumed to be fixed in the heliocentric system. Because of their orbits around the sun, the planets move slower or faster as they circle a stationary earth, but they always move forward at from 361 to 365 revolutions per year, or roughly once per day, never backwards. This is a specious objection to geocentricity.

(3) King Alfonso the Wise sounds just like know-it-all heliocentrists who would presume to tell God how to design the universe. "Useful hints for better ordering of the universe" indeed!

(4) The heliocentric system is *not* "simpler," as Mr. Coleson supposes. Just try to picture the motion of the moon in a moving-earth, moving-sun, moving-galaxy system like heliocentricity. Geocentricity has many pedagogical advantages, because what you see is what you get with geocentricity, and one doesn't have to rely on contorted explanations of "apparent" motions and such, which only confuses students. I have yet to find one of those "obvious advantages" of heliocentricity referred to by Mr. Coleson.

(5) I'm no expert on the Catholic Church, but I don't think the Church handled the Galileo Case badly at all. They did clearly recognize the issue forced by Galileo, which was whether the Bible was accurate and dependable when it said the sun "stood still" and "hasted not" in Joshua 10:13, or whether it would have to be interpreted phenomenologically rather than literally, and they chose the Bible over Galileo's "heretical opinions." It is really sad that the modern Catholic Church has decided to back off from this sound position and rejuvenate Galileo in order to make peace with the anti-biblical scientific establishment, which is an exercise in futility if I ever saw one.

Mr. Coleson does recognize that Galileo was not treated badly by the church after his condemnation. He actually performed some of his most famous work during his house arrest, which is what gave him his reputation in the physics community. His *Two New Sciences* book was

written then. Getting slapped down may have been the best medicine and true catalyst for this work, just as a child may benefit from getting straightened out by punishment, provided the child accepts it.

R. G. Elmendorf
Bairdford, PA 15006

Dear Editor:

Warmest greetings in the mighty name of Jesus Christ!

I am Enrico S. Lucena, a servant of the Lord at the Polytechnic University of the Philippines in Sta. Mesa, Manila. I became a Christian in 1989 and have been a part of the Jesus Is Lord Fellowship - campus ministry. I am a fourth year electronics and communications engineering student.

God gave a vision that the campus will fall into communism if Christians will be careless and lazy. The teachings of evolution, atheism, humanism and communism are greatly deceiving the minds of the students. In Manila, this university is famous for its political activism and blatant rebellion against the government. Satan has built a lot of strongholds against the Gospel of Christ.

I have formed "Students for Creation Science" in order to take action against the teachings of atheism and evolution. I would like to help other Christians to depend and build up the Christian faith. Deep in my heart I would like to turn this campus upside down for Christ and tear down the strongholds of Satan!

I am making a special request if you can provide some old and used materials that deal with creation, atheism and evolution. It would greatly help us get more informed and trained!

Hoping for your grace and support,
Enrico S. Lucena
420 Perla St.
Tondo, Manila
Philippines

Dear Editor:

The first Romanian Creationism Seminar was a success (it is not only my opinion). We praise the Lord Jesus, He was our guide!

In the seminar took part Rev. Dr. Iosif Ton, president of the Romanian Missionary Society, Dr. Ioan Alexandru, member of the Romanian Parliament, Dr. Charles Thaxton, USA, from Konos Connection (in Prague), and many others.

Our biggest desire is to create an organization similar to yours. Any information and materials will be a great help for us. We begin to translate into Romanian articles from your Quarterly.

Thank you once again for your help and encouragement. We received the Summer '93 CSSHQ. We are waiting to hear news from you.

Doru Gogulancea
Romanian Christian Agency
OF. 1; POB 198
2000 - Ploiesti
Romania

DISOBEYING GOD'S FIRST CREATION ORDER TO MAN: "BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY"

Ellen Myers

Immediately after God created man in his own image and likeness, "God blessed them and said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28). This blessing and order were repeated after the Flood; "Then God blessed Noah and his sons, saying to them, 'Be fruitful and increase in number and fill the earth'" (Genesis 9:1). We read that "Sons are a heritage from the LORD, children a reward from him. Like arrows in the hands of a warrior are sons born in one's youth. Blessed is the man whose quiver is full of them" (Psalm 127:3-5), and that "Blessed are all who fear the LORD, who walk in his ways. You will eat the fruit of your labor; blessings and prosperity will be yours. Your wife will be like a fruitful vine within your house; your sons will be like olive shoots around your table. Thus is the man blessed who fears the LORD" (Psalm 128:1-4). It is the burden of this paper that most people in the so-called Christian West have disobeyed God's first creation order to man, have despised His promised blessing attached to it, and will therefore be stripped of dominion and prosperity in favor of other people who have obeyed God's first creation order to man.

Factual and statistical information substantiating this charge comes from the well researched article "The Cost of Wholesale Contraception" by James A. Miller.¹ Miller reports that on May 9, 1960 the U. S. Food and Drug Administration approved the birth control pill as safe for contraceptive or birth control use. At about the same time the Pill also began to be taken by Western European women. This marked the end of the baby boom and beginning of the disastrous Sixties. At first the Pill's effect was slow, but births began to decline from an all-time high of 4.3 million in 1957 by more than 16 percent in 1964. By 1965 the American birth rate had declined to 19.4, a level barely above the rate of the Great Depression. Birth rates kept declining till an all-time low of 14.6 in 1975. This decline took place, amazingly, amidst mounting propaganda for "zero population growth" spearheaded by Dr. Paul Ehrlich's 1968 book *The Population Bomb*.

The first to feel the consequences of this demographic development were the maternity wards of hospitals, and next, the manufacturers of baby food such as the Gerber Products Company, which suffered a decline in sales for the first time in its history in 1973 and whose earnings fell 50% between 1973 and 1974. Other baby food companies

and maternity shops likewise declined or even went out of business. Developments in other Western nations were similar.

On May 9, 1968, exactly eight years since the Pill was approved, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists promulgated a new policy asking that "social and economic factors" be considered in allowing abortions. In 1970 the American Medical Association adopted a similar policy. Public demand for legalized abortion also arose due to "contraceptive failure." Abortions in the U.S.A. now number an estimated one and a half million annually and may rise substantially as the Clinton Administration removes legal barriers still left from the Reagan and Bush era. Abortions around the world number around 55 million annually.

American elementary schools were hit next. From 1979 to 1982 children entering first grade were a million fewer each year. In 1985 there were nearly eight million fewer elementary school students than in 1969. This decline caused a surplus of elementary and intermediate school buildings and teachers.

Not only the Pill but sterilization, chosen increasingly as the surest and permanent means of birth prevention, took its toll. In 1965 73 percent of American husbands and wives aged 15 to 44 were able to have children; this total declined to 52.7 percent by 1982. At the same time, the share of wives or husbands who had been surgically sterilized climbed from 15.9 percent to 38.9 percent according to a study released in February 1985 by the U. S. National Center for Health Statistics.²

Next, the high schools were "reeling from the birth dearth of the late 1960s and early 1970s" (*American Demographics* magazine). Colleges broadened admissions, lowered their retention standards, or else recruited overseas. The highly visible presence of many third world students on American college campuses today is largely due to this development.

The economy at large began to suffer as the absence of millions of customers contracepted or aborted out of existence took effect. Consider especially the declining need for new housing, which is the pace setter for the rest of the economy. Experts predict that total new housing starts including rental apartments, which already dropped from 1.75 million units in the 1970s to 1.5 million in the 1980s, will fall to about 1.1 million by the mid-90s. This situation may continue well into the next century and be relieved only by immigration. Incidentally, housing built since the 1960s reinforces the birth dearth cycle by making little if any provision for large families. Today the rare Christian couples obeying God's creation order to be fruitful and multiply must almost invariably do with old, obsolescent housing in decaying neighborhoods to shelter their children.

As is becoming well known, contraception and abortion threaten the Social Security systems in the West. The ratio of workers to retired persons is expected to drop from 4-1 now to about 2-1 soon. Miller writes that "The only visible answer is young, tax-paying immigrants." As to Europe, it is slowly vanishing. In nation after nation, the number of births occurring annually has already fallen below the number of deaths. Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Great Britain and Hungary slipped into natural population decrease during much of the '80s.

Some of the lowest fertility rates ever registered in all human history - about 1.3 children per woman, more than 40% below the zero-growth rate - have been registered in such "Catholic" countries as Italy and Spain. The fertility rate for Europe as a whole has been running about 1.6. Recent demographic projections have put Western Europe's population in 2050 at a *hundred million fewer persons*. Huge social disruptions are already occurring as millions of immigrants from Africa and the Middle East flood the emptying continent next to them. ...

The same inexorable logic applies in the U.S. and throughout the developed world. People from healthy birth-rate nations are being recruited into below-replacement nations. ... Throughout the industrialized world, xenophobia is appearing along with these: an economy going sour, families breaking, sexual diseases rampant, abortions rising. ...

In what can only be called an addiction to the Pill, nation after nation is literally losing the will to reproduce and survive.

Miller's sobering report ends here. Add to it that in Europe many of the immigrants are Muslims who in some instances are buying unused, empty formerly Christian churches to transform them into mosques and demand that Muslim law (the Shariah) replace the law of the country in districts where they have become a majority (it has happened in England). Their leaders are well supplied with financial resources for expansion and proselyting by oil-rich Arab governments. If this development continues, it will mean a rude chastening for the vast majority of European secular materialists and severe persecution, like in most Islamic countries today, for the small Bible-believing Christian minority.

Now the Muslim people did obey God's first creation order to be fruitful and to multiply, and this is why Islam is the world's fastest growing religion today. It is estimated that Muslims will number 1.9 billion people, or 25% of all humanity, by the year 2020, a scant generation away. Europeans, on the other hand, including European Christians, did not even replace themselves. Thus the Muslim people may accomplish the hegemony of Europe in the twenty-first century which they failed to obtain by war five hundred years ago. As to the United States, Hispanic immigrants may well recover by sheer population pressure the American Southwest wrested from Mexico a hundred years ago.

Disobedience of God's first creation order to be fruitful, multiply and fill the earth characterizes the overwhelming majority of Western Christians. Not God their Creator and Lord but the wealth and wisdom of this world is evidently first and foremost in their minds when it comes to having children. This materialistic attitude prevails in almost all churches as well. No sermons are being preached about God's first creation commandment, nor about the clear implications of Romans 12:1, which entreats Christian believers to "present your whole bodies as living sacrifices, holy and pleasing to God, which is your reasonable (or spiritual) service." We are not obeying this biblical, New Testament call when we withhold our bodies' reproductive capacity from our Lord. Yes, some dear couples cannot have children or not as many as they would like, for childbearing is a gift from God's hands

(Genesis 16:2; 21:1-2; 25:21; 30:2; 1 Samuel 1:19; Luke 1:25, 36-37; etc.). With others one spouse yearns for more children while the other is adamantly opposed; the Lord knows their thoughts and innermost hearts (Ps. 139:1-4). Many Christian couples, like their non-Christian contemporaries, were voluntarily sterilized in the 1970s and 1980s. Now a few of them, persuaded of the unbiblical nature of this step, obtain reversals and rejoice in more children.

All this is in stark contrast to the Russian Christians persecuted under Communism. Through most of the 1980s this writer sent letters of encouragement to hundreds of Russian Christians imprisoned in the Gulag for their faith, and to their families. Amazingly most of them had many children (five, six, seven and more were quite common). This is a shining testimony to their obedience and trust in the Lord, and it is one important reason why Christianity persevered through seventy years of merciless suppression. It is doubtless also a reason why our Lord has now rewarded them with religious liberty actually greater than in the United States! They can pray, read and be taught the Bible, and study scientific evidences against evolution and for creation in their schools, universities, and over their public television stations; in supposedly Christian America we cannot.

The idea that the world is facing a population explosion threatening our environment and/or food supply has been advanced since the late 1960s when the decreasing birth rate in the West was already well under way. Numerous well-informed researchers have refuted this idea with solid facts. On the alleged population explosion, consult especially the masterful book by Princeton professor Julian Simon, *The Ultimate Resource* (Princeton University Press), which documents the blessing and indeed necessity of population growth for the economy. Professor Simon is not a Bible believer, yet his work confirms the benefit of obedience to God's first creation command to man. Another excellent resource book is Humboldt State University professor Jacqueline Kasun's *The War Against Population* (Ignatius Press). An older but still most informative classic in this field is Dr. Colin Clark's *Starvation or Plenty* (New York: Taplinger, 1970), documenting that by using the agricultural methods practiced in the Netherlands in 1970 a world population of 35.1 billion (seven times the present population) could be fed at a very high living standard (pp. 157-158). For recent information on alleged hurt to the environment, see the book by Dixy Lee Ray, *Trashing the Planet*; Ellen Myers, "Population Resources and Ecology - A Bibliographical Essay," *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, VI:4 (Summer 1984); Carl E. Bruce, "Environmentalism - Leading Mankind Down the Garden Path," *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, XIV:4 (Summer 1992); or contact the organization Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, P. O. Box 65722, Washington, DC 20035.

God's very first commandment to man recorded in the Bible tells us to be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and have dominion over it. It came to us with God's blessings, and children are His reward (Psalms 127 and 128). We have not fulfilled it, nor has it been superseded by the lying doomsday prophecies of God's and man's enemies ultimately inspired by Satan (Ephesians 6:12). People who will not be fruitful and

multiply will sooner or later lose their dominion over the land they occupy to other people who do obey God's first creation order. Last but not least, we Western Christians, unlike our persecuted brothers in the East, have almost wholly exchanged faithful obedience to God in the matter of having children for the materialistic wisdom, wealth and comfort of this present godless world. As God blessed our brothers in the East for their sacrificial obedience, so He will punish us for our disobedience to this, His first creation order to man.

References

¹*HLI Reports*, Vol. 11, Nos. 6-7, June/July 1993 (published by Human Life International, 7845 Airpark Road, Suite E, Gaithersburg, MD 20879, USA).

²"Sterilization Prevalent, Study Says," *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, Monday, February 11, 1985, p. 7A.

A CHRISTMAS LETTER TO MY SUNDAY-SCHOOL CLASSMATES

Karen Bruce

I endeavor to write this letter with humility and hope that my comments will not offend or anger anyone. I hope you will take it for what it is—a deeply prayerful attempt to encourage you to seek God's face and follow after His will regarding your children.

I would never even have thought to write except for a conversation which took place two weeks ago in the toddler room where I was babysitting during church service. At the time, I listened to what was being said, praying in my heart, but I was afraid that any disagreeing comments I might make might be taken as perhaps a holier-than-thou type of condemnation. I hope that it will be clear after you read that this is not at all my intent. My intent is, rather, to encourage you to value your children (if you have any at this time) as your *most precious treasure given you from God*, and to take His gift of childbearing to you as a woman as a precious gift from God also.

The conversation I listened to focused on another mom at Messiah, not present in the room, who has recently become pregnant and who is apparently quite ill with morning sickness. The three moms in the toddler room universally expressed their thankfulness that they were not pregnant, that they were not suffering from morning sickness, and that all three of them were very grateful that they were not going to have any more children. Two of the moms have two children, the third has three children, and the oldest said her age is 31. They also universally expressed their happiness that they were getting over with and through the child-rearing process now, while they were young, so that they wouldn't have to go through it when they were older. I am not singling them out, nor am I attempting to put them down, as I believe this is the prevailing attitude of moms in our class and in general.

However, I was greatly saddened and hurt for them. I would like to share with you from my own life. You see, my attitude was not far from this just a few years ago. I had always wanted to have a large family, as I came from a family with seven children, so my "cut-off" point was higher than most, but the underlying philosophy that this was "our" decision as a couple was still very much present.

Our second child was born 19 months after our first, our third 20 months later, and our fourth was expected just 15 months after the third. It was not easy for me to make the transition from being around lots of people, first when I lived at home, and then on the job, to being at home alone all day after our first was born. At the time, I had a good friend with five children—when I had just one—and I wondered how in the world she could do it all. When I was expecting that fourth child, I

realized that I would have four children ages 4 and under! I had some spotting during the early part of the pregnancy, and I secretly hoped that I might have a miscarriage. (I thank my Heavenly Father for not granting my wish.) Then, when our fifth child became expected 20 months after the fourth, I was angry—angry with my husband and angry at God. Now I would have five children ages six and under—a prospect that seemed overwhelming. At that age, you have very little help with any of the standard household chores, you have to get everyone ready yourself, and you have to take everyone with you everywhere.

However, I want to make clear that we didn't "prevent" these children because overall, we wanted a large family—it just seemed that God was moving along faster than we would have liked. At the same time, and actually (believe it or not) with the birth of our second child, we began to hear comments from others, Christians and non-Christians, about "calling it quits." As our family expanded, the comments became more pointed and oftentimes downright crude. Only rarely, very rarely, did anyone compliment our large family or refer to children as gifts from God.

In part due to our own "practical thinking"—we can't afford any more kids—and in part due to the negative flak we received regularly, we gave serious thought to turning to artificial methods of birth control while we were expecting our seventh child.

And then God stepped in and totally upended our "We're in control" attitude. On April 17, 1985, He determined in His perfect timing—though in a totally unexpected and extremely painful way for us—that He should call our Jacob, just under four years old, to heaven. (This was the child whose conception I had been so angry about.)

Suddenly, in grief so severe it would be useless to explain, we were brought on our knees constantly before God to humble ourselves to His wisdom and His planning, both in giving of life to each of us and in taking it away. The one comfort through this was that in submitting to His perfect will ("The LORD gave, and the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD. In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly." -Job 1:21-22), that God was working out our lives to become more like Christ and to glorify God.

But in addition, we were brought face to face with the realization that we would have given **everything**, and I mean **every** dollar, our home, any property, security, possessions—**everything** if God would have said He would give us Jacob back to raise on this earth. **All** the worldly "treasures" and "securities" we had built up over eleven years of marriage were *worthless*. Our *real* treasure, our little boy, was indeed in heaven. Suddenly we realized that possessions, career goals, our "dream" of living in the country, artwork we had made or might make, counted for absolutely nothing at all. We will all leave these behind, either accomplished or unfulfilled, and in the end, God is going to burn up this old world anyway, along with any house we've built, etc. But the **only** thing we might take with us, saved by faith in Christ's death for us, is our **children**.

In the death of Jake, God turned our values around. We became aware of all kinds of ways that we had picked up the world's way of

thinking. Believe me, the world does **not** consider children "a heritage of the LORD." They would classify conceiving a child as merely the result of "unprotected sex," not "...the fruit of the womb is His *reward*." (Ps. 127:3)

The question is, how many of us as Christians have taken this area of our lives—the giving of children to us by our Heavenly Father as our reward—and taken it to ourselves? We *don't* consider children as God's reward. We tell God that He isn't able to provide for an additional child because we don't think **we** can provide. We tell God that He isn't able to give us the patience and strength and courage to raise an additional child. So, instead of asking God to provide for any child He would desire to reward us with, we tell Him we would prefer something else instead—something that will never equal the treasure of a living child, created in God's image, worth the blood of Christ which is greater than any other. One comment made by Randall Terry that has stayed in my mind is that Christians use the **same** reasons to prevent children that women use to justify abortion. How can our attitude toward having children be the same as that, and still be right?

This letter is, then, a prayerful plea to seek after God and His will (not our own) regarding God's reward of children. Please, earnestly search the Scriptures and *pray* for His guidance. Remember that He is able to do "exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think." (Eph. 3:20) "Submit your *bodies* as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." (Rom. 12:1) If you feel convinced that you absolutely have God's leading, *with Scriptural backing*, to prevent conception (God knows your medical and marital situations with perfect understanding), then seek His will in how this should be accomplished.

I only recently learned that **all** Christian denominations —Protestant as well as Catholic— believed that artificial contraception was un-Scriptural until roughly the 1930's, the same time frame that most other "liberalizations" came into our churches, and (like abortion) it was introduced as acceptable only in the *most extreme* circumstances. Abstinence from relations during the woman's fertile period to prevent conception was the only method considered Biblical because it had respect to God's design of men and women in tying together sexual oneness with creation of new life. (I am still astounded that God has enabled us to partake in His creation of new life.) Please remember that "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 4:23) In this most critical area, **please**, submit it to God and go to the Bible for direction.

I caution you especially to be aware **not** to utilize any method which always involves (IUD's) or which may involve killing a conceived child (**all** types of birth control pills, which try to prevent conception from occurring, but then *prevent implantation* as a "back-up" method *if conception occurs*. This is an abortion of your own child which you may cause and not even be aware of!)

Again, I ask that you not take this letter as dictating your actions, or as a judgment on how you stand before God. I am simply trying to share my own, very painful, journey I had to make to value my own children as God's rewards to me. I also hope that our family, by God's grace, encourages some of you who cannot imagine how they could

possibly cope with more children. I have often been encouraged by the widespread example of Christians under Soviet persecution, where the fathers were frequently imprisoned for their faith, who even under those terrible conditions had large families. They were able to accept children because of the deepness of their faith that God would sustain them, even under such severe circumstances. I couldn't cope on my own, either, but God has graciously provided physically and emotionally. I can honestly say, also, that the years pass very quickly by. The time that seemed so impossible, with so many little ones, has gone by. Now, our older children are an immense help in keeping the household running.

We also find that we can get by with a lot less than what we think of as "necessities." Just to share, our home has only three bedrooms—though, thankfully, they are large ones. This puts our five girls in one room and our four boys in another, with Dad and Mom (and in times past baby) in the third. We have survived with only one bathroom, though I admit that it isn't too private a lot of the time (more like Grand Central Station). I used to wistfully dream about getting to take a bath by myself. Now, I sadly realize that I won't **get** to share my baths with a little one much longer.

Lastly, I would like to share a deep-felt encouragement for those who would love to have a baby, but God has not enabled this at this time (though do not give up your prayers). I know, through the sorrow of Jacob's death, what a tremendous yearning there is for little ones and the pain of absence. One thing that God brought home to me was that I must cast out the world's reasoning and take His Word as absolute. He says, as a fact accomplished, "He maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to be a joyful mother of children. Praise ye the LORD." (Ps. 112:9) I do not know how He will fulfill this, but **I do** know that He certainly will bring it to pass, perhaps in heavenly places. Whatever reward He has withheld from you now, He will recompense in ways we cannot dream of. If He has called you to glorify Him in the deep adversity of childlessness, cling to Him during this time, because He will reward you an hundredfold for anything you have had to give up for His name's sake—for your testimony in this trial.

THE POPULATION CRASH

Fred Domville

The following article was originally published in June 1973 (the year abortion on demand was legalized nationally by the U. S. Supreme Court) by the Population Crisis Council, 333 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60601. It was then distributed in pamphlet form by pro-life organizations. We are reprinting it in abridged form in connection with Ellen Myers's paper "Disobeying God's First Creation Order to Man: Be Fruitful and Multiply" published elsewhere in this issue.

If there was once a time when we could debate the population problem, that time has clearly passed. Those who cite the hard facts claim that we may have passed the point of no return. And the facts have never been harder.

Even if we could miraculously halt the drop in average family size at two children (from around eight 150 years ago, and close to four just 15 years ago) - and there is not the vaguest sign that we can or will - the American people would be extinct in a few thousand years. Gone (2 are needed for replacement, and we crashed through that gaining speed). A one-child average - not impossible, or even distant at the rate we're plunging - would empty the country in several centuries, almost faster than it was settled.

And even now, there is growing popularization of the no-child "family." Our reaction to this incipient national disaster will have analysts shaking their heads for years to come.

For some time we have seen forecasters predicting a surge in the birth rate. Indeed, as late as the 1970s, a dwindling band of stargazers was still waiting for the postwar babies to grow up and reproduce, setting off a secondary "boom." In reality, it was precisely the years when the postwar babies were coming into reproductive age - the 1960s - when the "baby bust" took hold, quietly but ominously lowering the preschool population from 20 to 17 million. Total births declined for seven straight years after 1961, then paused. In 1970, the birth rate pulled back up nearly to its all-time Depression low. The real decline had not yet begun.

The '60s "baby bust" was over. The '70s "birth dearth" was upon us. Already there are fewer babies being born than 25 years ago - in fact, more like as few as 50 years ago. (Births exceeded three million annually in the early 1920s, and may or may not reach three million in 1973.) But these figures are deceptively reassuring. What they fail to reflect is that we have been riding the crest of an unprecedented boom in the population of young adults. This growth is now extremely rapid, near its peak. While our total population growth is now far below 1% a year, the population aged 15-45 (against which fertility rates are measured) has been growing 2% a year, and the 20-30 population (from which most parents come) has been surging 3%. This powerful advantage will quickly recede, and disappear entirely in the '80s, when the

leverage will reverse. Thereafter, young adults will actually be fewer in number each year. This will mean that even a rising birth rate could bring fewer and fewer babies.

Nothing in our history suggests that a rise in the birth rate can be sustained. With the exception of the postwar baby boom, it has never happened. And the future promises to add to the accelerating technological obstacles to birth. The present situation is this: with our young-adult population surging in record numbers - over a million a year - our child population is falling in record numbers. We are now losing a million children a year.

Needless to say, the population crisis took the "experts" completely by surprise. Incredible as it seems even in this brief retrospect, not until 1970 did the Census Bureau formally admit even the possibility that the United States could ever stop growing - and then only as an outside chance, far into the next century (2037). Yet by 1971, "zero growth" was seen as a certainty by 2001 - perhaps even 1980 - by Prof. Donald Bogue, University of Chicago demographer and past president of the Population Association of America. Such forecasts soon became commonplace.

Yet complacency persisted, as if the end of our growth were insignificant or even welcome. Indeed, back in 1970, popular spokesmen on population were calling for reduction of the birth rate to the replacement, or "zero growth," level as a positive national goal. By now many people are aware that we have reached the parental replacement level nationally. It happened so fast that we missed it completely. It may have been as recently as 1972. For to replace ourselves, all women must reproduce at an average rate of 2.11 children. Census Bureau calculations place the average at a near 2.08 for the first half of 1972, and a rapidly retreating 1.98 for the second half.

A look at the past will give us the perspective to see that what we are confronted with now is only too real. Statistics on the U. S. birth rate go back to 1820, when it was 55 per 1,000 population. By 1920 it had declined to 28, falling almost in half in a century. Yet in barely another half century it has nearly fallen by half again, to 15.6 in 1972. Another fall of half by the end of this century would only be an extension of a 150 year trend.

But a realistic look at the nearer future casts doubt on whether we can maintain even that pace of deterioration. In fact, the fertility rate has recently been declining at a pitch that could halve it by 1980. The cumulative forces now working to effect this wreckage are so increasingly overwhelming in combination as to crush any actuarial prospects of our revival as a people. Obviously, any species that no longer replaces itself is committing ecological suicide. And it could be faster than almost anyone has dared to imagine, for we have means today of erasing ourselves more readily than ever before, and the "values" to use them.

One man with a working wife who had just bought a house in a new development expressed today's priorities on a phone-in show when the host asked if he had any children. He laughed. "Children are a luxury," he explained. But the most eloquent expression of the New American Dream may have come in the form of a picture that appeared

on a Planned Parenthood poster, which said it all. It simply showed a cradle full of money. "An Unexpected Child Can Really Rock The Cradle," it noted subtly. Nothing could have better illustrated what and where today's values are.

The biggest percentage gain of all new stock issues in the year 1971 was scored by Berkeley Bio-Engineering, a company manufacturing the new suction abortion machines. The second biggest gain was registered by a contraceptive maker.

In January 1973 the birth rate scraped another new low: an officially estimated 14.6. That was the last month abortion was illegal in America.

The effect of national legalization of abortion has been roughly projected by pro-abortion authorities in terms of birth rate. The Rockefeller Commission estimated it would reduce it a tenth; Dr. Christopher Tietze anticipated a drop of a seventh. A reduction of a tenth to a seventh would cut our population a third to a half in four generations. Thus a century from now, for example, instead of having 150 million people we could have only 100 million, or even 75 million.

But the total factor of abortion is only one of the accelerating negative influences on the birth rate. Far more devastating over the long term is another growing rage: sterilization. One long term study indicated that surgical sterilizations had increased from roughly .1 million annually in 1961 to 1.1 million in 1971 (.8 male, .3 female). By 1972, annual estimates were actually ranging as high as 3 million, though some later reports suggest a tapering off. But the consensus seems to be that sterilizations are now well into seven figures annually, on a numerical par with abortion.

What makes sterilization far more damaging demographically than abortion is this. One sterilization can prevent more than one birth. It is precisely the long range nature of its effect that makes it the hidden cripple in our unlisted vital statistics that renders blind any hope of a foreseeable revival of our people.

Voluntary surgery for sterilization has become so rampant among both sexes that in 1971 Dr. Louis Hellman, head of HEW's new Office of Population Affairs, predicted that by 1975 20% of American couples would have an artificially sterilized partner. This would mean that a 25% surge in the birth rate among able-bodied couples would be needed to offset the sterilization factor alone.

A further consideration is that sterilization will markedly increase the number of couples with no children at all. Historically, childlessness has ranged between 10 and 20% - around the high level in 1950, the low in 1970. This means that it has only been by enlisting a surging number of young adults at peak proportions in the ranks of new parents that we have been able to maintain even our present birth rate. Should 20% of new couples include a sterilized partner, childlessness could quadruple, with childbearing couples reduced from 90% to 60%. But there is no reason why artificial sterilization has to stop at 20% in 1975 [it actually rose to 38.9% in 1985 according to the U. S. National Center for Health Statistics]. And the mounting incidence of involuntary sterilization, one of the silent, long term side effects of both induced abortion and venereal disease, cannot even begin to be

estimated.

It is true that people are marrying in record numbers, but a sharply rising proportion of statistical marriages do not represent new family formations at all, but merely realignments. These remarriages are typically effected by women divorced three or four years. Since the median duration of broken marriages is seven years, these are typically fertile years, comprising a major rupture in a reproductive life that may or may not be resumed. Meanwhile the first-marriage rate has actually plunged to its lowest level since the Depression.

In 1961 there were 1,548,000 marriages and 414,000 divorces and annulments. By 1971 marriages had risen to 2,196,000, a gain of 42%; but divorces totaled 768,000, up 85%. In 1972, all marriages increased 73,000, while divorces rose 71,000. The faster old marriages break down, the more reluctant young people are to begin new ones. From 1960 to 1970 the adult population grew by 33 million (114 to 147), but the married population rose only ten million (84 to 94). Meanwhile the unmarried population more than doubled, from 17 to 37 million. Should marriage fall as far out of fashion as it did in the 1920s, the plunging birth rate would have to bear still another heavy drag.

A few social theorists suspect marriage may be going out of style altogether. Something like that could be happening in Sweden, where marriages are down 40% since 1966. In 1971, it was reported that women there were having children at the depleting level of 1.75. But perhaps the country most concerned about the population crisis is Russia, racing us for the world lead in divorce. There the birth rate is 11.

Few dare even to think where the population crisis may be leading us, and how fast. But recently an officially sponsored think tank symposium produced a jarring glimpse of the mediate future. A report compiled by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara foresaw America in 2000 where few families had more than two children, and many had none. In that tomorrow, half the population was over 50, and a third over 65. The HEW, which commissioned the report but also does an exploding hundred million dollar business in birth control programs, has apparently suppressed it and will disclose no plans for it; the Center, following government instructions, will release no details of it. You might say it has become "inoperative."

Almost like the future society it reflects.

Editor's Note: Between 1980 and 1990 the United States population grew from 226,542,203 to 248,709,873 according to the U. S. Census Bureau, a total increase of 22,167,670. Immigrants accounted for about one third (7,338,000), leaving a net internal increase of 14,820,670 in 10 years. This amounts to an annual average increase of only about .6 percent, and this might well sink to zero by the year 2000, just as Dr. Donald Bogue of the University of Chicago predicted in 1973.

THE AFTEREFFECTS OF EVOLUTIONISM

Dominique Tassot

On October 30, 1991 the Environment Commission of the European Parliament adopted a resolution presented by Mr. F. Amendola, Italian "ecologist" delegate, on the "universal rights of the animals." Certainly Christianity has always recognized the place of all creatures in God's plan of the universe. Genesis shows us certain kinds distinguished by God from the beginning for being associated with man; on the sixth day, "God made the wild animals according to their kind, the domestic animals according to their kind, and all the animals that move along the ground according to their kind. And God saw that it was good" (Gen. 1:25).

Then we see that Noah was saved only with the land animals, confirming to which point man and the animals are tied together here and now, and the care that man must take to insure survival for all, the "clean" animals (provided for the sacrifices) and the "unclean" ones (not for sacrifice). We also see that the very ancestors of Christ lived the lives of shepherds and devoted themselves to the care of livestock. We see how the prophet Nathan accuses David of the death of Uriah the Hittite by praising the tenderness and familiarity towards the animals in terms which are in no way behind the reports of Henri Bosco: "The poor man had nothing except one little ewe lamb he had bought. He raised it, and it grew up with him and his children. It shared his food, drank from his cup and even slept in his arms. It was like a daughter to him" (2 Samuel 12:3).

But at the same time universal harmony imposes an order in the bosom of creation. Precisely so he can watch over the animal world man occupies the summit of this living hierarchy: he rules it, the proper meaning of the verb "radah" (Gen. 1:26); he is the "dominus," the master of this animal "house" (domus) for which he will be held responsible since he is the only created being endowed with moral conscience, the only one capable of acting intelligently over all the others.

The context spells out in which sense we should understand this term. It is said: "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground" (Gen. 1:26). This concept of man as "image of God" makes of the human being an exception among the other creatures. This analogy makes him capable of a personal relationship with God. It establishes in him a quality of being which makes him similar to God and which he will never be able to lose despite his own refusal. But it is inasmuch as he is similar to God that man is called to rule the world; it is this particular character which justifies his presence here below and

gives meaning to his existence.

Verse 26 therefore does not at all give man a blank check to crush pitilessly everything which is not created in God's own image. On the contrary, it makes us accountable before God for the blood of all these lower brothers. If after the Flood God authorizes man to eat meat, He is careful to reserve the soul, that is, the blood, of it for himself (Genesis 9:4) to show clearly that this rule is a delegation of divine authority and not a right of ownership.

But at the same time, to deny in man this specific quality of being a person capable of a reciprocal relationship of intelligence and of personal love with God is to offend the Creator in a manner which the most foolish among the "philosophers" of the eighteenth century would not have dared to imagine. Even Diderot in his dreams perceived in man a "reason" which distinguished him from the "brute." And Buffon noted in his "Natural History": "All will agree that the most stupid among men is sufficient to guide the most spiritual among animals; he rules it and makes it serve his purposes, and this less by force and skill than by superiority of nature, and because he has a thought-out project, an order of actions and a sequence of means by which he compels the animal to obey him, because we do not observe that the animals which are stronger and cleverer command the others and make them serve their own usage." (Buffon, *Histoire Naturelle*, t. II, Paris, 1749, p. 437).

It is thus the most profound and the most vital concept of Christianity which a Commission of the European Parliament has agreed to reject. The listing of motives shows this well; it would be ridiculous if it were not staggering. Read only the following:

The animal is born, it learns, it is curious, runs, eats, keeps up relations with its kind, mates ... It is neither better nor worse than we, only different.

... suffering, joy, love, self-awareness, altruism, the sense of communication, the capacity for analysis and for problem solving or cultural heredity are not the exclusive attribute of the human species, since in certain particular cases some of these characteristics are even more present in individuals belonging to other species. These prerogatives ... suffice to grant the individual which has them (the animal) ... the right to have its own requirements taken into consideration on an equal level [with man] ... Civilization cannot flourish unless it is closely linked with the abolition of discrimination. The dynamics which has permitted to overcome antinomies like lord-slave, aristocrat-plebeian, black-white, man-woman, healthy-handicapped, heterosexual-homosexual, has opened up, historically speaking, fundamental advances in terms of the quality of life. The recognition of rights of individuals not belonging to the human species represents a logical consequence of this tendency."

For the biblical vision decreed by creation these parliamentarians have substituted a confused democracy in which the same people of good will are going to petition that a tree be not felled but see nothing wrong with thousands of legalized abortions. And if it became neces-

sary some day to choose between the life of a man and the life of a tiger, in the name of what philosophy would one forbid the animal to exercise its right to food? You can see that when pushed to their logical end these ideas are absurd. It would be nice to see a day when F. Amendola, pursued by a rabid fox, would pluckily explain to it its duty to respect a man who has done so much for its brothers with tails! I strongly doubt that the fox will hear this speech, kneel down in dismay and gratitude, and concede to the delegate his right to a healthy life! ...

Now when we look for the intellectual error which underlies this manner of pretending to equality between man and the animals, we see it appear clearly in the theory of evolution. If man descends from the ape, there is nothing in man which is not also found, at least in embryonic fashion, in animals. Man is "different," as our delegates recognize, but it is only a difference in degree, and this conclusion is impossible to reject no matter how "humanist" one might be elsewhere. One is thus compelled to either reduce man to the rank of the animals (the materialist option), or to promote the animals to the rank of human beings (the sentimental option). In both cases there is great mental confusion and the loss of the proper meaning of human life.

Thus evolutionism shows itself as something quite different from a scientific theory: we have to do with an ideology which, like a cancer, obscures little by little all aspects of thought, which induces absurd behaviors, which is the entire contrary of true poetry because it eliminates the mystery of humanness. Even if one remains uncontaminated oneself, it is not without profit to evaluate all these contaminations. By contrast they show the importance of the truth in a society; they show to men of science that their responsibility extends well beyond their work; they give splendor to the precious supernatural indications lying hidden within the biblical vision of Creation.

Editor's Note: Translated and reprinted with permission from Science et Foi, No. 24, 2nd Quarter 1992, published by CESHE (Cercle Scientifique et Historique), F-02800 Vendeuil, France.

EVOLUTION AND LEGAL STANDARDS

Joseph Sobran

A recent news story mentioned the "evolving standards" of - I don't remember what. The Supreme Court, maybe. Or was it Western civilization?

How, I wonder, can a standard "evolve"? How, for example, can the meaning of the Constitution, except by amendment, change? Or how can what was wrong yesterday become right today?

G. K. Chesterton observed that an evolving yardstick - one whose length kept changing - would be pretty useless for purposes of measuring. If our standard of good keeps changing, he asked, how can we decide whether a given change is an improvement?

We think human sacrifice was a bad thing. But the Aztecs saw nothing wrong with it. People can get used to nearly anything, as long as everyone else in their society accepts it as normal and natural.

In the same way, Americans today are used to things their ancestors would have regarded as evil and tyrannical. Younger Americans, who have grown up with legal abortion and omnipotent government, are learning to accept these things as traditional.

Only three decades ago, liberals used to cite the moral object lesson of "good Germans" - obedient, law-abiding German citizens who failed to protest Nazi tyranny and defended mass murder at the Nuremberg trials on grounds that they were only following lawful orders. Today, though, most liberals urge us to welcome "change."

Without a stable standard of right and wrong - one that doesn't "evolve" - how can we condemn human sacrifice (which in its day, after all, was the latest thing in cultural evolution)? Or how can we decide what the law should be? After all, the Nazis and communists claimed the mantle of progress for their societies. So do the proponents of abortion, and so human sacrifice has returned to the modern world under new forms and new names.

The words "evolve" and "evolution" have probably generated more sheer intellectual mush than any other words in our time. The idea of evolution has been transferred from biology, where it may mean something, to ethics and politics, where it nearly always produces confusion.

To any unbiased reader, the U. S. Constitution has a clear meaning. It specifies and limits the powers of the federal government. Yet we are supposed to believe that it has "evolved" into a document that means nearly the opposite; that it allows the federal government to do nearly anything.

If you point out to the average liberal that the Constitution does not empower the federal government to impose a compulsory national health care plan, he will say, "Oh, but the Constitution is a living document! It has evolved with the times! It no longer means what it

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Winter 1993)

meant in the dim primeval days of Jefferson and Madison!"

Ah, the hypnotic power of the word "evolve"! It's usually enough to stop further questions. The word sounds as if it means something intelligent (though perhaps a bit over our heads). But in fact, it means nothing intelligible. It turns words into rubber yardsticks of meaning.

The result is that the Supreme Court gets away with assigning its own arbitrary meanings to the Constitution and ignores the meanings inherent in the text. A fashionable school of thought even insists that inherent meaning doesn't exist, that all texts are "unstable." But if that were true, what would be the point in having either a Constitution or written law itself?

The ideal of "evolving standards" does have one, albeit sinister, advantage. It removes all limits on power. It lets the state define its own authority, without the restraint of inherited meanings and shared understandings. It annihilates legal tradition and makes the interpretation of law a game without rules.

Change and development are necessary and unavoidable, even in law and public morality. But we have to distinguish the things that can and should change from the fixed principles that can keep change from becoming a devouring monster.

Unfortunately, our public educational system - Hugh Kenner calls it the Ignorance Factory - obliterates such distinctions. Americans bow their heads at the holy word "evolution" and let the court tell them what their Constitution says.

The other day I saw a youth wearing a T-shirt with the simple commandment: "Evolve." Such piety!

Reprinted from July 1993 newsletter of Summit Ministries, Postal Box 267, Manitou Springs, CO 80829.

JURASSIC PARK: THE NEW ORTHODOXY?

Trevor J. Major

Dinosaurs roam a private island off the coast of Costa Rica. Moats and high voltage fences keep the vicious *Tyrannosaurus* away from its natural prey, and their human keepers. A giant *Apatosaurus* strolls gracefully across the fields, while an ostrich-like *Gallimimus* pauses to drink from a lake. This is Jurassic Park, a dinosaur zoo positioned in the theme park market.

Yet before it has opened to the public, things begin to go awry. There are the usual budget overruns, but there are also accidents among the workers. The investors get nervous, and send a delegation of scientists to inspect the park. They are joined by two of the owner's grandchildren, and so begins an exciting adventure packed with teeth and claws.

The movie *Jurassic Park* is topping box-office records. Promotion and merchandising have reached heights all their own. Once again, Steven Spielberg has delivered thrilling, wonder-filled entertainment.

No one has missed the educational impact of this movie. Kids love dinosaurs, right? Of course, many of them will not see the movie because it gets very intense and graphic. But parents and teachers can still use the deluge of *Jurassic Park* paraphernalia to teach children all about dinosaurs. With such an intense interest, even little ones can master basic paleontology, nomenclature, and dinosaur biology.

Jurassic Park rides on the crest of a dinosaur craze that has been going on for many years now. The movie, and the countless books on the subject, teach that dinosaurs were the product of evolution, and that millions of years separated man and dinosaurs. Fortunately, creationists can counter with good materials that teach kids a biblical perspective (e.g., Taylor, 1987; Bromling, 1991; Gish, 1992). However, the movie warrants attention because it makes some special claims.

Can Dinosaurs Be Cloned? First, we have to remember that *Jurassic Park* is science fiction. As one reviewer commented, the science "is only stuffing to ease the suspension of disbelief" (Gee, 1993). The fantasy behind the story is that scientists can clone dinosaurs. This is explained quite well in the movie, although the book by Michael Crichton (1990) discusses the process in more detail.

It began millions of years ago with mosquitoes sucking on dinosaur blood. Some of the pesky insects landed on trees, where they were trapped by sticky resin. After many years, the resin hardened into amber, thus preserving the insects and their meal. It is then up to scientists at Jurassic Park to extract the stomach contents, and isolate the dinosaur DNA. However, the DNA is not intact, so they use sophisticated equipment to fill the gaps. Where this does not work, they use DNA from other organisms, such as frogs. Finally, they insert

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Winter 1993)

the completed DNA sequence into crocodile ova, and the dinosaurs are allowed to grow in artificial eggshells.

This whole scheme brings up some important questions. For example, can scientists clone dinosaurs? The answer right now is "No." The reason is that dinosaurs, like humans, are very complicated organisms. Scientists could clone individual cells or portions of DNA, but they will need a lot more than mummified blood cells. As David Grimaldi quipped, trying to reconstruct the whole dinosaur DNA sequence "would be like trying to reconstruct Tolstoy's *War and Peace* from a gigantic vat of alphabet soup" (1993, 102[6]:61).

Has anyone actually found dinosaur DNA? Not yet, but someone may announce a discovery in the near future. Already, scientists believe they have recovered DNA from insects, plants, pollen, mushrooms, and microscopic creatures entombed in amber. But if this amber is millions of years old, how could something as fragile as DNA survive for so long? Tomas Lindahl (1993) is so skeptical about recovering DNA from ancient amber that he is willing to suggest that labs are analyzing samples contaminated with modern DNA! The other alternative, and the one consistent with the biblical view of the world, is that the amber is really only a few thousand years old. Further, organisms preserved in amber are strikingly similar to their living counterparts (DeSalle, 1992; Cano, et al., 1993; H. N. Poinar, et al., 1993; G. O. Poinar, et al., 1993). This suggests that general stability, not large scale change, is the dominating feature of life on Earth.

One last point while we are on the issue of cloning. As stated earlier, Jurassic Park scientists patched dinosaur genes with DNA from frogs. This was a reasonable thing to do, we are told, because all animals have a common ancestry, and so their DNA is very similar (Crichton, 1990, p. 209). However, similarity can also mean common design. Most cells carry out basic tasks that have to do with perpetuating life. Also, we would expect to find similarities in cells that perform the same function in different animals. Evolutionists are quick to point out that our DNA is 99% the same as chimpanzee DNA. But this does not explain why we are flying space shuttles, while they have climbed little higher than the tree tops.

Did Birds Evolve From Dinosaurs? One recurrent theme in the movie, and certainly one that is emphasized in the book, is that birds evolved from dinosaurs. This theory, developed by John Ostrom, is especially favored among paleontologists (Norman, 1991, p. 137). They believe that the ancient bird *Archaeopteryx* descended from a small theropod dinosaur, and thus was the intermediate between birds and reptiles.

Ornithologists, however, are not convinced by this theory. They count all the differences between birds and dinosaurs, while Ostrom counts all the similarities. For example, Alan Feduccia points out that *Archaeopteryx* had many distinct bird-like features, and that birds were already well-developed before theropod dinosaurs existed (see Major, 1993).

The point is that evolutionists cannot agree on the origin of birds, and neither paleontologists nor ornithologists can account for something as fundamental as the feather.

Conclusion. *Jurassic Park* has exerted great influence because it is such a juggernaut of a movie. Overnight, speculation has become conventional wisdom. However, the idea of finding and cloning dinosaur DNA raises many questions that challenge evolution. The story also suggests that birds are modern dinosaurs, and yet there are many problems with this theory.

Dinosaurs, though extinct, are here to stay. They have the power to spur the imagination of young minds, but let us not quash this fascination. Yes, evolutionists are using them to promote their theory, but we can use them to teach about God's creation. Let us give our children the tools to recognize good science, and interpret it correctly.

Bibliography

- Bromling, Brad T. (1991), *God Made Dinosaurs* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).
- Cano, Raid J., et al. (1993), "Amplification and Sequencing of DNA from a 120-135-Million-Year-Old Weevil," *Nature*, 363: 536-538.
- Crichton, Michael (1990), *Jurassic Park* (New York: Ballantine Books).
- DeSalle, Rob, et al (1992), "DNA Sequences from a Fossil Termite in Oligo-Miocene Amber and Their Phylogenetic Implications," *Science*, 257:1933-1936.
- Gee, Henry (1993), "Jaws with Claws," *Nature*, 363:681.
- Gish, Duane T. (1992), *Dinosaurs by Design* (El Cajon, CA: Creation-Life Publishers).
- Grimaldi, David (1993), "Forever in Amber," *Natural History*, 102(6):58-61.
- Lindahl, Tomas (1993), "Instability and Decay of the Primary Structure of DNA," *Nature*, 362:709-715.
- Major, Trevor J. (1993), "A Theory for the Birds," *Reason and Revelation*, 13:23.
- Norman, David (1991), *Dinosaur!* (New York: Prentice Hall).
- Poinar, G. O., B. M. Waggoner, and U. C. Bauer (1993), "Terrestrial Soft-Bodied Protists and Other Microorganisms in Triassic Amber," *Science*, 259:222-224.
- Poinar, H. N., R. J. Cano, and G. O. Poinar (1993), "DNA from an Extinct Plant," *Nature*, 363:677.
- Taylor, Paul (1987), *The Great Dinosaur Mystery and the Bible* (San Diego, CA: Master Books).
- Wieland, Carl (1993), "Meet 'Mr Living Fossils' - An Informative Interview with Dr. Joachim Scheven," *Creation Ex Nihilo*, 15(2):14-19.

Reprinted with permission from *Reason and Revelation*, Vol. 13 (August 1993), 62-63.

BOOK REVIEWS

E. Michael Jones, *Degenerate Moderns: Modernity as Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior.*

San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993. Softcover, 259 pp., \$19.95 ppd. Order from Ignatius Press, 33 Oaklawn Ave., Harrison, NY 10528.

E. Michael Jones, a staunch traditional Catholic, pulls no punches about the provocative thesis of his book, which "is simple: modernity [is] rationalized sexual misbehavior. All the intellectual and cultural breakthroughs of modernity were in some way or other linked to the sexual desires their progenitors knew to be illicit but which they chose nevertheless" (p. 17). For Jones this conclusion follows from his belief that "the intellectual life is a function of the moral life of the thinker. ... to the extent that one prescind from living the moral life, [one's intellectual product] will be more a function of internal desire - wish fulfillment, if you will - than external reality. ... In the intellectual life, one either conforms desire to truth or truth to desire" (p. 16). The examples by which Jones seeks to demonstrate the validity of these include Margaret Mead, Sir Anthony Blunt, John Maynard Keynes and their influential homosexual circle, Dr. Alfred Kinsey, Pablo Picasso, Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung, and, surprisingly, Martin Luther who lived in the sixteenth century, plus assorted modern intellectuals of lesser fame.

Jones's thesis is not substantiated as the book stands. It is too broad, for there are very influential modern thinkers of whom no illicit sexual behavior is reported. For example, Charles Darwin who gave us the pernicious and empirically false evolutionism of our time, and John Dewey, the father of progressive education, instantly come to mind. Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant and G. F. W. Hegel, the philosophers who paved the way for contemporary godless modernism as much as anyone, have never been accused of sexual misconduct, nor has the apostate priest and New Age cult figure Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

On the other hand, Jones's thesis is too narrow. There is a solid biblically based case for Jones's foundation statement that "the intellectual life is a function of the moral life of the thinker." Not only wrong sexual but *all* morally wrong desires war against true reality created by God and seek to pervert it. As our Lord Himself said, "By their fruits you will recognize them [false prophets and teachers]" (Matthew 6:15-20); "No good tree bears bad fruit, nor does a bad tree bear good fruit" (Luke 6:43); "For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false testimony, slander. These are what make a man 'unclean.'" (Matthew 15:19) The unregenerate will bring forth evil from their fallen, unregenerate hearts, and

CSSH Quarterly

Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Winter 1993)

their minds are blinded by their unbelief. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Proverbs 1:7). "All who hate me {God's wisdom} love death" (Proverbs 8:36). The very fall of Adam and Eve, the ultimate root of modernity, involved not sex but rebellion at large against God.

Of course regenerate people may fall into sin and error, too, and this is why we cannot sort out sin and error from goodness and truth on the basis of the personalities of their perpetrators. Furthermore, only God knows their hearts; we can only see their outward behavior and appearance, and often their sins are revealed only long after they have died. How, then, should we expose error? Jones gives us the answer in his statement about Newtonian physics in his epilogue:

If Newton's doctrine is true, then the biographical details about its development are irrelevant. If it or any other theory is not true, then that material becomes much more relevant. If the theory can be shown to be a deliberate falsification, then the biographical material becomes all-important. It becomes the only possible way to make sense of an otherwise inexplicable theory. (p. 258)

Precisely. The truth or falsehood of a doctrine must be established before the personal life and motives of its author are relevant. This is the point which the great Christian teacher C. S. Lewis made so forcefully in his essay "Bulverism":

It is no earthly use saying that those [thoughts] are tainted which agree with the secret wishes of the thinker. *Some* of the things I should like to believe must in fact be true; it is impossible to arrange a universe which contradicts everyone's wishes, in every respect, at every moment. ...

In other words, you must show *that* a man is wrong before you start explaining *why* he is wrong. ...

On the assumption that Christianity is an error, I can see [easily] enough that some people would still have a motive for inculcating it. I see it so easily that I can, of course, play the game the other way round, by saying that 'the modern man has every reason for trying to convince himself that there are no eternal sanctions behind the morality he is rejecting.'¹

The attempt to invalidate a man's teaching by attacking his person is the well-known error known as the *ad hominem* argument. Jones refers to a recent book by eminent British historian Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), which, like *Degenerate Moderns*, documents the enormous private moral failings of modern intellectuals, and which therefore in some readers' opinion "came perilously close to the *ad hominem*" (p. 13). Jones thinks Johnson's book is too "empirical" because it supposedly tells a multitude of facts without drawing a conclusion. Actually Johnson does draw a very definite conclusion well substantiated by the facts, namely, that modern intellectuals are arrogant elitists unable to lead disciplined lives and therefore should not be entrusted with public leadership. Johnson not only delves into his subjects' unsavory private lives but also prop-

erly substantiates his conclusion by showing the shoddy, deceitful research behind their social theories, such as Karl Marx's communism. A theory such as evolutionism thus must be and is invalidated on empirical grounds (such as complexity of even the "simplest" cells, no transitional forms in the fossil record, life cannot come from non-life), or on its historical fruits (such as Nazism, Communism, Social Darwinism, racism, eugenicism) rather than the personal character of its proponents.

Jones's best case for his thesis is that of Margaret Mead, who did her anthropological research in Samoa for the express purpose of validating her own sexual "polymorphous perversity" (adultery and lesbianism). This information is also reported in detail by Dr. E. Fuller Torrey in *Freudian Fraud* (New York: Harper Collings Publishers, 1992). Mead's book *Coming of Age in Samoa* purported to show the absence of any sexual morality among a South Sea people disbelieving in original sin, and it greatly contributed to the loosening of sexual mores in America and the West. Mead became a sort of idol in her profession and the news media. Only after she died in 1978 was Australian anthropologist Derek Freeman able to get a public forum for his research exposing Mead's many basic errors about Samoa.

Jones's section "Homosexual As Subversive" is well done and contains the important insight that there is an important connection between the "childless vision" of homosexuals and the deficit economics of homosexual economist John Maynard Keynes. An interesting sidelight is "the trajectory of [the] intellectual, spiritual, and moral decay, from Evangelical Christianity ... to Victorian respectability masking loss of faith" (p. 57). This insight is due to Gertrude Himmelfarb's article "From Clapham to Bloomsbury: A Genealogy of Morals" (*Commentary*, February 1985). Jones cites Himmelfarb's comments on Leslie Stephen, who "lost his faith in the 1860s as a direct result of the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*," and was the father of four of the charter members of Bloomsbury, a clique of outspoken immoralists determined to live only for their pleasures of the present moment. Keynes belonged to this clique.

Jones's excellent section "The Case Against Kinsey" deals with Dr. Alfred Kinsey, author of the influential but now debunked reports on human sexual behavior. He explains that Kinsey

[connected] homosexuality and evolution by calling his homosexual histories 'the most marvelous evolutionary series'. Evolution had become the matrix for deviance, and both had become synonymous with scientific progress away from outmoded moral norms. Without the legitimatizing aura of Darwin, without evolution as a scientific justification of deviance, Kinsey would have been just one more middle-aged man obsessed with pornography. With them as his philosophical underpinning he could collect pornography with impunity and even flout obscenity laws in court. ... Kinsey's contribution to modernity is homosexual entomology. It is an ideology - constructed with the help of Darwin - in which deviance is the

cause of all progress. Without deviance there would be no human society, no human beings, no higher animals ... As a result of his immersion in Darwinian theory ... Kinsey came up with a theory that allowed him to undermine the concept of the norm, both social and personal, in the area of sexual morality. (p. 99)

Kinsey's extremely questionable work and research methods have been analyzed at length by Dr. Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichel in their book *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination Of A People* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990), cited by Jones (and reviewed in *CSSH Quarterly*, XIV:3 (Spring 1992), pp. 28-29). Kinsey's personal life is still not open to public investigation because the Kinsey Institute "wants to keep his life a dark secret" (Jones, p. 115). Thus Jones's thesis that rebellion against sexual moral norms lies at the root of modernity is very plausible but not as yet substantiated in black and white in Kinsey's case.

Jones's section on Pablo Picasso ("Cubism As Sexual Loathing") is the book's center as shown already on its cover by the reproduction of Picasso's painting "Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J.)" which ushered in Cubist-modernist painting in 1903. This essay is in a class by itself and alone worth buying the whole book. This is, first, because the accompanying pictures by Picasso show more clearly than words how Picasso dehumanized the women whom he lusted after, painting them beautiful in the traditional manner and then throwing them away physically and pictorially by robbing them of their true form. Jones shows clearly and frighteningly that Picasso was well aware of what he was doing. Unlike other modernist painters, he "never made a break with the visible world," telling Françoise Gilot that he wanted to

give it a form which has some connection with the visible world even if it is only to wage war on that world. ... I want ... the possibility of recognizing nature, even distorted nature, which is, after all, a kind of struggle between my interior life and the external world ... I want that internal surge ... to propose itself to the viewer in the form of traditional painting violated. (p. 150)

Jones understands that Picasso's "break with the tradition was an index of his hatred not only toward the spiritual values of the West but toward the human body and spirit that the West prized as good" (p. 151). He understands that

Picasso's mutilations of the female body ... presage simultaneously in a visual way the concentration camp, the abortion clinic, and the pornographic film, and may well have helped pave the way for all three. Picasso's war on representation was a war on the tradition that begot it as well, a tradition that saw the human being as possessing infinite value. (pp. 142-143)

This chapter deserves nothing but the highest praise.

Jones suspects Sigmund Freud of incest with his sister-in-law Minna. Both Freud, and more strongly Carl Jung, his erstwhile disciple, were involved in the occult. Jung carried on long-standing

adulterous relationships with two of his patients, Sabina Spielrein and Toni Wolff. Both Freud and Jung burned relevant parts of their personal correspondence. Jones believes that they both, but especially Freud, projected their own deviant desires upon all mankind in order to assuage their own guilt. An excellent discussion of the lack of any scientific basis for Freudian theory independent of Freud's private sexual life has recently been made by psychiatrist E. Fuller Torrey in his book *Freudian Fraud*.

Jones's last chapter on "Luther's Enduring Legacy" lacks convincing evidence. In view of Jones's thesis Luther's sexual immorality should have been proven and connected with his theology beyond any possible doubt. Luther's marriage, of course, broke his vow of celibacy freely made when he was a Catholic monk and priest, but was not "sexual immorality" in the modern sense of complete sexual lawlessness. Other alleged instances of Luther's immorality are based on isolated passages in Luther's private letters dealing with his fleshly temptations (not deeds), ambiguous jokes, calling his wife, Kaethe, his "chain" ("Kette"), and rumors.

Jones overstates his case when he writes that "Libido culminating in broken vows was the engine that pulled the Reformation train" (p. 244) and "Luther, like Hugh Hefner, discovered that the only way to make use of libido effectively was to create for his contemporaries an escape from the guilt that accompanied its satisfaction" (p. 245). Luther achieved this, Jones claims, by his book *De Servo Arbitrio* (*The Bondage of the Will*), which "condemns sin and yet ... asserts that the will is not free to resist sin or do virtue" (p. 237). Catholic teaching, Jones says, goes back to St. Augustine who tells us that "Freedom of the will ... isn't taken away because you have been helped by grace, rather you have been helped because it hasn't been taken away" (p. 236). Based on our Lord's Parable of the Wedding Feast (Mt. 22:1-14) "Catholics believe that the will is free to accept or reject the grace that God offers" (p. 237). Many non-Catholic Christians today share this stand. The chapter also draws parallels between Luther and popular contemporary priest/writer/speaker Brennan Manning.

Jones ends with a fine epilogue "Moral Relism: The Ultimate Deconstruction," in which he shows that true reality created by God inevitably defeats all who would deny it to gratify their sinful desires. Here is the gist of his closing argument:

Our intelligence, our mind, all our faculties are all at the beck and call of the will, which can choose to use or abuse what it has at its disposal. A mind clouded by passion is like a window covered with dirt. It is not transparent; it is aware only of itself. ... The turning away from the truth at the behest of disordered passions does not mean that the mind will stop functioning; it only means that that mind will not perceive the truth. And after a period of laboring in the dark, the mind can choose disorder over order and create for itself idols that it will serve instead of the truth placed in the universe by the Creator who is synonymous with truth. (p. 259)

Recommended, despite reservation about the author's thesis shown above, as one of the most lucid, informative, stimulating and essentially true commentaries on our lawless, rudderless modern time.

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

¹C. S. Lewis, *God in the Dock* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 272, 273.

Paul deParrie, *Romanced to Death: The Sexual Seduction of American Culture.*

Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, Publishers, Inc.
1989. Hardcover, 273 pp. incl. Endnotes and Index.

Paul deParrie is a father of six, a pro-life activist involved in Operation Rescue operations in the United States and abroad (most recently in Poland), the author of *The Rescuers* and co-author (with Mary Pride) of the excellent eye-openers *Unholy Sacrifices of the New Age* (on the death-dealing aspects of modern medicine) and *Ancient Empires of the New Age* (on what ancient paganism, now in fashion again in the post-Christian West, was really like).

Romanced to Death traces the sexual revolution in the West to its historical beginning in the late Middle Ages. At that time the word "love" was redefined to mean the emotional state of "being in love" rather than a commitment. What Steve Gallagher of Pure Life Ministries says of the sexual addict applies to multitudes who consider themselves normal, regular modern people: they are "feeling oriented, rather than obedience oriented."

DeParrie accuses the medieval church of neglect in combatting the corruption of the true meaning of love, and of the other virtues as well. He laments that

the virtues were no longer regarded as real and definable. They had become mere ideals to be sought and *felt*. In [the medieval song of] *Roland*, the virtue of courage, for instance, existed regardless of his feelings. In later works, it became necessary for the hero to *feel* courage well up in his heart. The impact on the reader was emotional. Rather than a stimulus to courage, it was an invitation to *feel* courageous (p.53).

True teachers of the Christian faith have always stressed the need for trust in and obedience to God rather than feeling. In his preface to his incomparable anthology of the writings of George MacDonald (published by Macmillan), C. S. Lewis singles out for special praise the fact that his mentor, who lived in the Romantic period, might easily have been "betrayed into valuing mere emotion and 'religious experience' too highly: but in fact [he relegated] feeling to its proper place." Lewis chose the following selection from MacDonald to begin his anthology: "That man is perfect in faith who can come to God in the utter dearth of his feelings and desires, without a glow or an aspiration, with the

weight of low thoughts, failures, neglects, and wandering forgetfulness, and say to Him, "Thou art my refuge." Elsewhere, MacDonald speaks to the soul troubled by emotional dryness:

Troubled soul, thou art not bound to feel but thou art bound to arise. God loves thee whether thou feelest or not. ... Fold the arms of thy Faith I say, but not of thy Action: bethink thee of something that thou oughtest to do, and go to do it, if it be but the sweeping of a room, or the preparing of a meal, or a visit to a friend. Heed not thy feelings: Do thy work.

These words of godly wisdom have strengthened this reviewer many times. And how often must we parents and teachers tell children objecting to some duty because they "don't feel like doing it" that it must be done nevertheless!

DeParrie goes on to describe the consequences of the initial semantic corruption of the word "love." Marriage was degraded next:

But the real attack here was against the underlying assumption that marriage was an institution designed *primarily* for and by God rather than to fulfill the desires and emotional needs of men and women. The purpose of Christian marriage had formerly been viewed as (1) glorifying God, (2) raising godly children, (3) serving as a model of the unity of Christ and the church, (4) a stabilizing influence on the larger family and society, and (5) an opportunity to give to another in a selfless manner. Into this chain was injected the concept of fulfilling powerful (though not necessarily mutual) emotional needs.

Literature portrayed this emotional experience as primary. ... Marriage began to be viewed as a consummation of an emotional state rather than a commitment of love in the Biblical sense.

As people became more and more preoccupied with their feelings, and hence more and more sensual, God became less and less important to them. Finally, with the appearance of Charles Darwin and his evolutionary view of man, "God had become a vestigial appendage—and He was the final reason for *any* moral standards." Prostitution, promiscuity, homosexuality and abortion became accepted. In the sexual exploitation of children the desire of the jaded pleasure seeker "finally focuses on his *real* target—innocence. ... his drive—as is Satan's—is the destruction of innocence, which is the precursor of all virtue." DeParrie quotes a *New York Times* reporter who found that among public high school students to call someone a virgin was their shorthand for geek, nerd, or weirdo. He also warns that "If you think that the selling of perversion has not affected you, consider the changing attitudes toward homosexuality and how it has affected laws and public life. If you are a woman, simply try to find a modest bathing suit." How sadly true!

One of the book's most important chapters deals with the compromises the churches have made with the corruption of love and all its rotten fruits. What unbiblical words and practices has the church not condoned in this area of "love"? DeParrie emphasizes that Scripture has much to say about perverse or twisted speech, which always

precedes perverse and twisted living. "It may seem petty to quibble over definitions," he writes, "but, for example, 1 million babies are slaughtered every year in America over the definition of the word *choice*." He rightly castigates the church's unscriptural acceptance of birth control as "a tool for stewardship," which has divorced sex from childbearing; God's very first creation mandate to man was "to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28). He cites Mary Pride, erstwhile feminist converted to Christ, prolific author, mother of eight, and stalwart pioneer of home schooling, who asks: "If children are a blessing [our Lord's reward, Psalms 127 and 128], why don't we want to have them?" Stashed away in his chapter on "God, Marriage, and Sex: Throwing off the Shackles" is his statement which could serve as the whole book's summary:

Love is *not* an emotion. ... It is *not* something you fall in, the poets and songwriters notwithstanding. Love is something you *choose* to *do*.

Jesus did not command us to feel good about our neighbors or our enemies. He commanded something infinitely harder. He told us to *love* them, to *do* for them what was God's best for them, whether we felt like it or not.

Complete with chapter summaries and extensive endnotes, this excellent book is like a drink of cold water in the desert of our contemporary muddled, mushy concept of "love," even among Christians. Highly recommended.

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT:

CSSHS to End Publication 1

EDITORIALS:

Paul deParrie: *Out With the New and in With the Old* 2

Fred Schwarz: *Human Life is Infinitely Valuable* 2

LETTERS 3

**DISOBEYING GOD'S FIRST CREATION ORDER
TO MAN: "BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY"**

Ellen Myers 5

**A CHRISTMAS LETTER TO MY
SUNDAY-SCHOOL CLASSMATES**

Karen Bruce 10

THE POPULATION CRASH

Fred Domville 14

THE AFTEREFFECTS OF EVOLUTIONISM

Dominique Tassot 18

EVOLUTION AND LEGAL STANDARDS

Joseph Sobran 21

JURASSIC PARK: THE NEW ORTHODOXY?

Trevor J. Major 23

BOOK REVIEWS

E. Michael Jones, *Degenerate Moderns:*

Modernity as Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior 26

Paul deParrie, *Romanced to Death:*

The Sexual Seduction of American Culture 31

Creation Social Science & Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 1536

MO ASSN FOR CREATION 994
405 N SAPPINGTON RD
GLENDALE MO 63122